

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
FACULTY SENATE HELD ON JANUARY 17, 1997,
IN THE MORRIS ROOM, THIRD FLOOR,
MARVIN CENTER

The meeting was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 2:15 p.m.

Present: President Trachtenberg, Vice President Lehman, Registrar Selinsky, Parliamentarian Keller; Deans Fowler, Frieder, Futrell, Keimowitz; Professors Agnew, Boswell, Captain, Castleberry, Elgart, Griffith, Gupta, Harrauld, Harrington, Johnston, Ludlow, Peroni, Robinson, Seale, Silber, Slaby, Smith, Solomon, Vontress, Wirtz, Yezer, and Youens

Absent: Deans Caress, Friedenthal, and Harding; Professors Brewer, Kahn, Kimmel, and Pelzman

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of December 13, 1996, were approved as previously distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

REPORT ON FACULTY CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY BY PROFESSOR ROBERT J. HARRINGTON, CHAIR, SPECIAL FACULTY COMMITTEE ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

Professor Harrington reported that the Committee has met and decided by consensus that the Conflict of Interest Policy adopted by the Senate in 1990 (Resolution 89/6) should continue as the Committee found no reason not to accept that as the policy. However, he said, the Committee did recognize that the resolution called for each school to establish mechanisms to implement this policy in a manner appropriate to each school should there be complaints or allegations regarding any conflicts of interest by faculty members in a particular school. Professor Harrington said that Professor Pelzman had agreed to look into the schools' implementation procedures, and he reported that, with the exception of the School of Engineering, there appeared to be no written procedures in the other schools for implementing this policy. Professor Harrington said that the Committee will meet to review the implementation policy of the School of Engineering, possibly using it as a model, and prepare a draft document in time for the Board of Trustees' meeting in February. The draft document,

of course, would have to be examined by the Senate and by the schools because the question will be whether or not the schools will want to implement their own particular requirements.

President Trachtenberg said that, if the Committee could provide the Board with a draft document that they can respond to, he thought that that would be very useful. He then asked Professor Harrington whether he thought the institution would be best served by having numerous implementation devices or by just having a single device. The President said that it seemed to him that the institution might be better off with a single set of procedures which, when used with some consistency and experience, develop as "common law" for instance. Professor Harrington replied that should a faculty member be found to be grossly in conflict, then the overriding document would be the Faculty Code, as far as the ultimate process is concerned. The President pointed out that it was not merely the outcome of procedures he was concerned with, but also the entry level procedures that have to be perhaps developed in a common format. Professor Harrington agreed that obviously across school lines one would need some sort of comprehensive document, but he noted that each school might have a slightly different attitude towards what constitutes conflict of interest.

Professor Wirtz pointed out that there has been a document under deliberation by the working group for some time that would seem to cut across all schools, but there were a couple of fairly serious problems that came out of that unified document. He said that the working group was in the process of clarifying those problems when the group decided to go with the individual schools instead. Professor Wirtz said that he has not seen the Engineering School model, but he would have reservations about the different schools operating on the Engineering School model. He suggested that another course of action might be taken which would be to tailor the unified document that the Committee was working on although he did not believe there was unanimous agreement by the Committee that it would want to go in that direction.

The President remarked that at least this subject can be discussed by the Committee, and Professor Harrington said that he thought the President's suggestion of interaction with the Board was an excellent one.

At this point the President asked if there were any objections to taking up a Briefing on the Sale of the Hospital as the next item of business not stated on the distributed agenda. No objections were made.

(The Senate moved to the Elliott Room for the slide presentation.)

BRIEFING ON SALE OF HOSPITAL

Ronald C. Willis, Assistant to the President for Congressional and Federal Relations, presented a brief overview of the partnership between The George Washington University and OrNda/Tenet. Noting that the University has been looking for quite a while for an infusion of capital to stabilize the hospital facility, he said that we do have a letter of intention between GW and its partner that is signed, and we hope to move through the process very shortly. He described his responsibility as working with the political community at the federal side and the city side to assure that all of the people in the community understand exactly what the impact will be when the University joins with its partner in continuing to have a full medical presence in Foggy Bottom. He said that those things which are critical to this community are the level of uncompensated care that is to be continually delivered, a stabilization of jobs, and an infusion of capital that will allow the Hospital to pay taxes. Mr. Willis pointed out that we attempted to join with a local nonprofit partner, but we could not align ourselves when it came to the academic mission and how that would be carried out. They also had planned to downsize the facility, turning it into what would be basically a community type hospital, only acute care, not a tertiary care center, and to move all of the patients to another part of the community. That would have decimated health care in the Washington downtown area, he said. By comparison, the OrNda/Tenet group have joined with other medical universities and other university systems and they are very, very competent at what they do. The OrNda HealthCorp and Tenet HealthSystem are expected to finalize their merger this month and GW and Tenet will then sign a partnership agreement and an application for a Certificate of Need which the District of Columbia must issue. Current legislation does not require the University to go back to the City Council and allows for the University to receive its Certificate of Need within a fixed time period. This legislation, he explained, was crafted with Medlantic, which is the other major health care provider in the District. Mr. Willis said that the slides to be shown to the Senate today would tell the story of this partnership and would be the first time it has been shown outside of the Medical Center.

Ruth Jordan, Director of Medical Center Public Relations, then presented slides which highlighted information about the GW Hospital and its partnership with OrNda/Tenet. In concluding her presentation, Ms. Jordan said the partnership is good for the University's employees, physicians, and students because it guarantees to keep the Hospital in Foggy Bottom, and OrNda/Tenet are leaders in integrated health care, which is essential in today's health care business. She then distributed a fact sheet which contained questions and answers about the GW/OrNda/ Tenet Partnership, together with the January 1997 issue of Progress

featuring an article entitled "Hospital Partnership Takes Essential Steps Toward Completion." (The fact sheet entitled "The Proposed GW/OrNda/Tenet Partnership" is attached.)

Professor Captain asked if there is a plan to reduce the Hospital staff because most mergers seem to result in downsizing. Ms. Jordan replied that the partnership is committed to keeping substantially all current employees.

President Trachtenberg said that if any points are to be taken away from this representation, they are the following: (1) the alternative was to close the Hospital; (2) the partnership continues to serve the academic and research mission of faculty and students; (3) some 1,600 jobs are preserved; (4) charity care will continue; and (5) the Hospital becomes a DC taxpayer. The President noted that the representations made in the partnership contract with the University are being backed by a company with annual revenues of \$9 billion, and the University thought that they would be able to live up to the terms of the contract.

Professor Peroni asked what the level of uncompensated care is at GW compared to Georgetown, for example, and the President replied that we give somewhat more uncompensated care than Georgetown, probably because of the location of our Hospital near the Metro subway line.

Professor Silber said that he did not understand how the Hospital would make any money since it was going to be providing the same level of uncompensated care and paying taxes as a for-profit hospital. Vice President Weingold explained that OrNda/Tenet could do a better job of running the Hospital because they have access to information and support systems that we do not have access to.

Professor Griffith said that he understood the issue with respect to actually obtaining the use permit is that there are a third more hospital beds in the area than can be filled. If a certificate of need is obtained, he asked if it were likely to be conditioned on downsizing the Hospital because of the oversupply of beds. Vice President Weingold responded that the University publicly announced that our bed number would be one-half of the 500 beds, and that we will be doing some downsizing of the Hospital but not closing it. Professor Griffith inquired about the time frame of putting the \$80 million into the investment, and Vice President Katz replied that the initial investment would go into the partnership on the day it is created, and how it is spent is dependent upon our capital plan which is basically a 6-12 months' plan.

Professor Wirtz said that, with the changing face of health care today, he thought the administration has put together a marvelous package that will serve us in good stead at the moment. However, he wondered what would happen if Tenet decided to merge with another partner or in fact allowed itself to be taken over which could lead to the dissolution of the partnership with the University as it currently exists, and he asked if there were terminology in the partnership contract about successors. Vice President Katz replied that the partnership agreement specifies that we have certain powers within the partnership and that there is terminology regarding successors in the contract.

Professor Solomon asked how the University will absorb the loss of revenue it now derives from the Hospital for performing a variety of services. The President responded that the University has been earning overhead from the Hospital of about \$5 million a year that is related to expenditures. Some of those expenditures will terminate with the change in the arrangement. For example, we will be able to realize some saving in the area of Personnel and Human Resources for the Hospital because Tenet will assume that responsibility. But the University will have to compensate for the loss of this revenue phased in over a number of years with hopefully alternate sources of income.

(The Senate returned to the Morris Room for the remainder of the meeting.)

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The report of the Executive Committee by Professor Boswell, Chair, is enclosed.

II. INTERIM REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Griffith, Chair of the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies, informed the Senate that a joint subcommittee was formed of members of his Committee and the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom to consider, at the request of Vice President Lehman, a proposal to establish an Institute for Computational Studies. The proposed Institute would operate between the schools and would be a degree-granting unit that would have not only research, but instructional components, as well. He said that this is a very complex proposal because it does not fit our current institutional structures and that there are many problems to be resolved before it can go forward. The subcommittee is working very hard on it and hopes to be able to have a report for the Senate fairly soon.

In the absence of Professor Pelzman, Chair of the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, Professor Griffith, a member of that Committee, said that he would like to report on some matters related to the slide presentation on the sale of the Hospital. For the record, he said that Vice President and Treasurer Katz has promised the Committee that we will have on the Senate's agenda for February an outline of the way in which the University will be responding to the impact on the University's budget of the withdrawal of the \$5 million support payment from the Hospital, the fiscal problems created by the enrollment drop in the graduate student population, plus the budgetary implications of what seems to be the utter necessity of moving forward into a more modern era on telecommunications on the campus. Professor Griffith noted that Vice President Katz has indicated that he will lay this all out for the Senate in a very clear and cogent way.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Yezer asked whether the press rumors that the University may be negotiating to buy a radio station was true, and President Trachtenberg replied that the reports were highly overheated and largely inaccurate. The most that can be said, he explained, is that we have made an inquiry about the radio station, but that that inquiry itself was quite explicit in pointing out that no offer could be made without consultation with appropriate campus constituencies.

On another matter, Professor Yezer said that he received a memorandum discussing Happy New Year with Windows '95 and that CIRC was planning to convert IBM compatible computers in our student labs from Windows 3.11 to Windows '95 during the summer 1997, which would affect all of the faculty. He said that it seemed to him that not many faculty have a box on their desk which will run Windows '95, and he thought that there is a disconnect between faculty computing and our plans for administrative computing. Because this change will go across faculty and schools, he thought a level playing ground would have faculty with sufficient access to the World Wide Web and sufficient computing power on their desks to run Windows '95. Professor Yezer recommended that an appropriate faculty committee should look into this matter. The President said that he agreed that someone should look into this matter and report back to him and Professor Yezer. Vice President Lehman pointed out that we have an Information Technology Advisory Council which has five subcommittees. The three which are probably most relevant to this matter and include faculty representation on them are: Instructional Technology, Technology, and Research. Rather than form another committee, he thought it would be worthwhile to become involved in what is already underway. Professor Griffith pointed out that the faculty do not have any idea of where we are in the planning stage, and asked when the faculty are going to see

some relief because they are really at a serious disadvantage. Vice President Lehman said that he could not give the precise timetable, but once the plan is finalized, the administration will be able to answer the questions as to what it is we will have to do financially in order to make this all happen.

Professor Gupta noted that a number of townhouses on the corner of 23rd and G Streets were razed last week, and he asked if the University owns this property and, if so, were there any plans for developing it. President Trachtenberg replied that the University does own the property, but there are no plans to build anything there in the near future, except perhaps for a gravel plot.

President Trachtenberg then made the following two points:

(1) In addition to following up on the fiscal implications of the drop in graduate enrollment, I hope the faculty will also want to work with Vice President Lehman into looking at the academic implications. To what extent is this generic to the industry, does this reflect on GW in terms of the degrees we are offering or the way we are offering them, and is this a temporary or a permanent decline, and if it is a permanent decline, what steps do we need to take to accommodate to that? In the short term, we are anticipating a slight bulge in undergraduate enrollments to try to compensate some of the lost revenue, but if we are making a major shift in the direction of the institution, then I think we ought to do so consciously, and not like a balloon that has a finger poked into it coming out at some other point.

(2) We had some exercises in budgetary restraint in the administration and one of the accommodations that I made to take some pressure off Walter Bortz was to give up the "President's Report," so that there will not be a specific President's Report published this year. Now the silver lining in this bit of melancholy news is that next year, being my 10th year as President, I am hoping to do a somewhat more comprehensive report to take a look at what has been accomplished over the decade. And one of the things I would like to have in the report is some mention of every one of our faculty. As you know, there are various reports that are circulated and in past President's Reports we list the name

of faculty who, for instance, have published a book, or received a particular honor or a prize for a distinguished lecture or something they have done that we can point to with pride. We are regularly getting about 30% of the faculty in this endeavor, but there is no reason why we cannot get something presumably from everybody about what they have accomplished over the course of a year that they feel good about, and we ought to identify that and cite it.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, President Trachtenberg adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.

Brian Selinsky

Brian Selinsky
Secretary

The Proposed GW/OrNda /Tenet Partnership

Preserving and Enhancing a Valued Medical Center Assuring Continuity of Care in Downtown DC

Why the Partnership?

Like other academic medical centers, the GW Hospital faces a turbulent operating environment. Faced by such factors as reduced reimbursement, technological advances that encourage outpatient -- rather than in-hospital -- treatment, and changing patient needs, hospitals increasingly must look to partnerships that bring the efficiencies and resources necessary to continue their mission.

Such pressures, expected to continue and intensify in the future, prompted GW to explore all available options for assuring and enhancing its ability to sustain its mission of medical care, research and teaching; while maintaining state-of-the-art clinical facilities in downtown District of Columbia and preserving the jobs of its employees.

Progressive Partnership

The George Washington University (GW) and OrNda HealthCorp (OrNda) have signed a letter of intent to create a partnership that will ensure continuity and enhancement of the GW Hospital in Foggy Bottom. This assures continuation of vital services, including the emergency room and trauma center, that the hospital historically has provided to the District of Columbia and the greater metropolitan area.

Ownership - Board of Directors

Under the agreement OrNda and GW will each be owners of the hospital, forming a limited partnership agreement. A partnership board will be established with equal representation from GW and OrNda. Certain reserve powers are retained by the University in order to assure GW's stewardship of the academic mission of the clinical faculty. The partnership board will create a hospital board of trustees which will include physicians and community representatives. This hospital board of trustees will be responsible for maintaining GW Hospital's accreditation and quality assurance; it will advise the partnership board and perform other functions common to hospital boards of trustees.

Still the GW Medical Center

The hospital is part of the broader GW Medical Center, composed of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences; the School of Public Health and Health Services, the GW Medical Faculty Associates and the GW Health Plan. While each of these medical center components is strengthened by emerging plans for the GW Hospital, their governance and operations are not otherwise directly affected by the proposed GW/OrNda partnership.

Why OrNda?

The search for an appropriate partner for the GW Hospital was a long and thoughtful one. All potential options, both non-profit and investor-owned, were explored. Five of the largest not-for-profit hospitals in this region were approached and only one responded with a proposal. Unfortunately, this proposal would have resulted in closing the hospital and was seriously lacking in commitment to hospital employees and GW's academic programs.

The four largest investor-owned systems also were approached. Of these, three responded with proposals, all of which would have retained the GW Hospital in Foggy Bottom and continued its community service and academic programs. Of these proposals, the OrNda proposal made the greatest financial commitment to restoring the hospital's patient care facilities and the strongest commitment to our academic mission.

Good for Patients, the Community, Employees, Physicians and Students

The partnership:

- guarantees GW's ability to continue and enhance the medical center's teaching and research mission on the Foggy Bottom campus;
- sustains modern and up-to-date facilities for GW in Foggy Bottom at the center of the District of Columbia, facilitating access for patients, physicians, faculty and students alike. Will provide additional employment as it reconstructs the GW hospital's clinical facilities downtown;
- continues GW's unrivaled tradition of outstanding emergency and trauma care for residents, local businesses and commuters, Congress, the federal and District of Columbia governments, the diplomatic community, and visitors;
- allows GW and its faculty to continue a tradition of caring for the city's uninsured and underinsured citizens, sustaining its notable history of uncompensated care, as well as its assistance for clinics and community programs that serve the poor and underserved such as Clinica del Pueblo, Health Care for the Homeless, The Whitman-Walker Clinic and Zacchaeus Clinic;
- provides jobs for substantially all of the more than 1,600 employees -- nearly 40 percent of whom are District of Columbia residents, with compensation and benefits consistent with the local market; assuring that the GW hospital remains one of the largest employers in the District of Columbia.
- transitions the GW hospital to a District of Columbia taxpayer, adding to the city's tax base through the payment of sales, excise, and property tax at a particularly critical time in the city's history;
- guarantees continuation and growth of outstanding centers of excellence for the treatment of cancer, AIDS and HIV-related illnesses, women's health, and high risk births, as well as the Neurological Institute, the Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, and the internationally-recognized Ronald Reagan Institute for Emergency Medicine.

How Does Tenet Relate to the GW/OrNda Partnership?

OrNda has entered into an agreement to merge with Tenet. Like OrNda, Tenet is a leading provider of healthcare services in the U.S., principally offered through acute care hospitals, specialty care facilities, outpatient centers, home health agencies and other health-related services and facilities. The two organizations share compatible philosophies of local leadership for the hospitals they partner. The following is a description of each:

What is OrNda?

OrNda is a leading provider of healthcare services in the United States, principally offered through its hospitals and complemented by primary care clinics, surgery centers, home health agencies, outpatient services, subacute care and other provider services. OrNda (pronounced Or-en'-da) is a Native American word that means "spirit of wellness."

- *OrNda is committed to meeting healthcare needs of diverse communities:* OrNda is committed to the communities it serves, providing \$155 million in uncompensated care in FY '96.
- *OrNda is committed to its partner hospitals:* OrNda is committed to improving and expanding services and equipment in all of its hospitals. For every \$1 that OrNda spends replacing or maintaining existing equipment and facilities, OrNda invests an additional 28 cents in improvement, upgrades or expansion.
- *OrNda is committed to excellence:* All 50 of OrNda's hospitals are accredited by the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the hospital industry's most respected accreditation organization. Centinela Hospital Medical Center in Inglewood, CA has an international reputation in sports medicine and orthopedic research. the Southern California Center for Immune Suppression at Midway Hospital Center Medical Center in Los Angeles, is recognized by the White House as a model center for the treatment of patients with immune suppression disease. Saint Luke's Medical Center in Phoenix, Arizona has a renowned orthopedic program and was the second facility in North America to install the most current cardiac catheterization technology.

What is Tenet?

With the Tenet acquisition of OrNda, GW gains an even stronger partner. Tenet will be an \$8.5 billion company following the completion of the merger. Tenet's operating philosophy is very similar to OrNda's. Tenet believes that the best healthcare delivery is tailored to each community. Prior to their acquisition of OrNda, Tenet provided \$309 million in uncompensated care in FY '96. All Tenet hospitals have governing boards consisting of physicians and civic leaders drawn from the community. Tenet is recognized in the health care industry for having a benchmark ethics program. This ethical standard has been disseminated to all of its 65,000 employees, and serves as a guide to employee conduct and behavior.

- Tenet's approach to partnering with academic medical centers and community not-for-profit hospitals is reflected in such examples as:

St. Joseph Hospital in Omaha, Nebraska, the teaching hospital of Creighton University. St. Joseph converted from its not-for-profit status, while continuing its teaching and research missions and maintaining the hospital's Catholic tradition of care to the poor and underserved in Omaha and its surrounding community. St. Joseph has and continues to provide indigent care, with over \$8 million in free or charity care provided annually. It also is the largest provider of care to Medicaid and indigent patients in Omaha. And more than \$21 million in funds have been invested in grants for scientific and educational purposes at Creighton University since the conversion.

Tenet and Louisiana State University have agreed to establish a teaching affiliation between LSU and two New Orleans area Tenet hospitals -- Kennar Regional Medical Center and Memorial Medical Center (formerly Mercy+Baptist Medical Center). LSU faculty will conduct their clinical practice at these facilities and there will be a significant expansion of the LSU residency program. The program will provide for an expansion of the LSU family practice residency, filling a vital need in the state for primary care physicians.

St. Francis Hospital in Memphis, Tennessee, became part of Tenet in 1994. It has continued to be a leader in providing community healthcare, in concert with its original mission. In addition to continuing its Catholic tradition of serving the poor and underserved in the Memphis community, more than \$11 million in local community grants have been awarded since the 1994 conversion.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
JANUARY 17, 1997
PROFESSOR JOHN G. BOSWELL, CHAIR**

(1) REPORT ON COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

A meeting of the Faculty Ad Hoc Committee to advise on the formation of the School of Public Health and Health Services with Medical Center Administrators and invited members of the Executive Committee and faculty members of the Department of Health Services Management and Policy is scheduled for January 31, 1997. The purpose of this, and a previous meeting, is to assist the new school to conform to the Faculty Code.

There are three other special committees that have been at work, but which are not yet ready to come to this body with a report and recommendations. One is looking into the relationship of tenure to salary. This committee grew out of practices in the Medical Center growing out of the provision of medical services by Medical School Faculty. Our Special Committee is examining implications of these distinctive practices for the rest of the University.

The second committee is not, strictly speaking, a Senate committee. On recommendation of President Trachtenberg in the late spring, I began meeting with the University's General Counsel and the Academic Vice President about the issue of schools within a school. Though the members of this informal committee are essentially of one mind, it remains to be seen whether we will be able to arrange an acceptable resolution of this matter. I expect to report to the Senate before the end of my term of office.

The third committee, established by the Senate, is a joint faculty-administration committee to examine the need for some established policy about retirement beyond what is currently in place. Professor Gupta is the faculty co-chair of that committee, which has been meeting now for two years, and he expects to be able to report by the end of this academic year.

(2) GRIEVANCE CASES

Three grievances from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences have been received by the Executive Committee. These cases are under review by the Executive Committee.

(3) COMMITTEE SERVICE

Please note that the forms for service on Faculty Senate Standing Committees and Administrative Standing Committees will be distributed with the agenda for the Senate's February meeting. I urge you to consider volunteering for service and to encourage your colleagues to volunteer also. These committees are our windows on the actions and activities of the University and we need to take them seriously.

(4) UPCOMING MATTERS

The annual report on recruitment and appointment of women and minority faculty will be presented by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at our February meeting. In addition, we're going to have a report on academic advising of international students. Also, Professor Solomon is expected to discuss the proposed new Mission Statement. At our March meeting, we expect to have a report on the status of the Washington Research Library Consortium.

(5) ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held Friday, January 31, 1997. Committee Chairs are asked to forward any reports or resolutions to the Executive Committee before that date for inclusion on the Senate's agenda for the February 14th meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE STANDING COMMITTEES

February, 1997

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC

TO: Members of the University Faculty Assembly

FROM: John G. Boswell, Chair
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

RE: Appointments to Administrative Standing and Special
Committees for the Year 1997-98

At its April and May meetings the Faculty Senate will recommend faculty for presidential appointment to membership on certain Administrative Standing Committees listed below. When the Executive Committee meets in March, it will draw up a list of faculty nominees for approval by the Senate.

If you are interested in volunteering your services--and I urge you to give the matter serious consideration--please indicate your preferences and return this form to:

**FACULTY SENATE OFFICE
RICE HALL, #305**

BY MARCH 7, 1997

Committee on the Judicial System
Committee on Student Publications
Committee on University Bookstore
GW Forum
Joint Committee of Faculty
and Students

Marvin Center Governing Board
Marvin Center Program Board
Panel for Student Grievance
Review Committees
Safety and Security Advisory Comm.
University Hearing Board

Name _____ Department _____ Rank _____

Currently serving on the Administrative Committee on: _____

Do you wish to be re-elected to this Committee? ____ Yes ____ No

I should like to serve on an Administrative Committee according to my preferences below:

(1st Choice) _____

(2nd Choice) _____

(3rd Choice) _____

I will be available for committee work during the regular academic year ____ Yes ____ No

I will also be available for committee work during at least one of the summer sessions ____ Yes ____ No

I prefer not to serve during 1997-98 ____.

Thank you for your prompt consideration of this matter.

FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

February, 1997

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC**

TO: Members of the University Faculty Assembly
FROM: John G. Boswell, Chair *JB*
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
RE: Call for Nominations for Election to Faculty Senate
Standing Committees, 1997-98 Session

In April, the newly-elected and incumbent Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will meet jointly "to nominate the members and chairmen of the standing committees and special committees" of the Faculty Senate for the year 1997-98.

It is comforting for faculty members to know that the Faculty Senate is participating in the governance of the University. There is a cost in time and effort for those faculty who are elected to the Senate itself and to those who serve on its committees. We cannot depend on the same people to always bear this cost. **We need you!** Please think seriously about serving on a Senate committee and contributing to shared governance in this university. If you wish to be elected or re-elected to a Senate Committee, please return this form to:

**FACULTY SENATE OFFICE
RICE HALL, #305**

BY MARCH 21, 1997

Administrative Matters as They
Affect the Faculty
Admissions Policy, Enrollment Manage-
ment and Student Financial Aid
Appointment, Salary, and Promotion
Policies (including Fringe Benefits)
Athletics and Recreation
Dispute Resolution Committee (3-year term)
Educational Policy

Faculty Development and Support
Fiscal Planning and Budgeting
Honors and Academic Convocations
Libraries
Physical Facilities
Professional Ethics and Academic
Freedom
Research
University and Urban Affairs

Name _____ Department _____ Rank _____

Currently serving on the Senate Committee on: _____

Do you wish to be re-elected to this Committee? ____ Yes ____ No

I should like to serve on a Senate Committee according to my preferences below:

(1st Choice) _____

(2nd Choice) _____

(3rd Choice) _____

I will be available for committee
work during the regular academic
year ____ Yes ____ No

I will also be available for
committee work during at least one
of the summer sessions ____ Yes ____ No

I prefer not to serve during 1997-98 ____.

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC**


The Faculty Senate

January 6, 1997

**The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, January 17, 1997, at
2:10 p.m. in the Elliott Room, University Club, 3rd Floor, Marvin Center.**

AGENDA

- 1. Call to order**
- 2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of December 13, 1996, as distributed**
- 3. Introduction of Resolutions**
- 4. Report on Faculty Conflict of Interest Policy by Professor Robert J. Harrington, Chair, Special Faculty Committee on Conflict of Interest**
- 5. General Business:**
 - (a) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor John G. Boswell, Chair**
 - (b) Interim Reports of Senate Committees**
- 6. Brief Statements (and Questions)**
- 7. Adjournment**



**Brian Selinsky
Secretary**